

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicants express appreciation for the telephone interview held with the Examiner on December 27, 2005.

In the August 15, 2005 Office Action, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croy (U.S. Patent No. 6,476,825) in view of Humpleman (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,971). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the references.

The Examiner contends that Croy discloses the selecting, transmitting and controlling steps set out in claim 1 and refers to an example in which a user selects a particular television program using the remote device and then the remote device obtains internally stored control information that it uses to program a VCR, which is connected to the base station, to record the program. (See FIGS. 23-24; and col. 17, lns. 32-47). Croy, however, only describes that *the remote device has an identification number*. The patent does not disclose or suggest that the VCR has an identification number. Moreover, because only one recording device, i.e., the VCR, is connected to the base station, the control information need only specify that the base station is to record the selected program and need not specify a particular device. Therefore, Croy does not disclose or suggest that the control information includes an *identification number* of the VCR, and it follows that Croy does not disclose or suggest transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus, an identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions.

The Humpleman patent describes a network that includes at least one client device and at least one server device. The patent does not disclose or suggest *transmitting* identification information from the client, i.e., from the controlling device, to the server, i.e. to the controlled device, and does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Croy.

Neither Croy nor Humpleman discloses or suggests:

transmitting, from the given one of the plurality of control devices to the information processing apparatus over the network, an identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and identification information corresponding to the 'given one of the plurality of control devices

as defined in claim 1.

Also, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Croy does not disclose or suggest that the base station includes a control correspondence table. However, the Examiner contends that Humpleman discloses this limitation and refers to col. 6, lns. 39-65 of the reference. Humpleman, however, merely describes that the server device stores control state data that includes status of the information in the graphical user interface (GUI) that is stored at the controlling client device. The patent does not disclose or suggest *the format in which the data is stored*. Therefore, Humpleman does not disclose or suggest *a control correspondence table*, does not disclose or suggest storing identification information corresponding to the selected one of a plurality of portions in *a control correspondence table*, and does not disclose or suggest storing identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices *in a control correspondence table*.

Neither Croy nor Humpleman discloses or suggests:

storing the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions and the identification information

corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices in a control correspondence table of the information processing apparatus such that the identification number corresponding to the selected one of the plurality of controlled hardware portions is associated with the identification information corresponding to the given one of the plurality of control devices

as called for in claim 1.

It follows that neither Croy nor Humpleman, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the method defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the references.

Claims 2-9 and 12 depend from claim 1, and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 2-9 and 12 likewise defines a combination that is patentably distinguishable over the cited references at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 10 relates to an information processing apparatus connected to a plurality of control devices over a network. The claim includes a receiver and a storage unit having limitations similar to those defined in claim 1. Therefore, claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over Croy and Humpleman for at least the same reasons.

Claims 13-18 depend from claim 10 and are patentably distinguishable over the references for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 11 defines an information control system that includes an information device having limitations similar to those defined in claim 10. Claim 11 is therefore patentably distinguishable over Croy and Humpleman at least for the same reasons.

Claim 19 depends from claim 11 and is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

620792_1.DOC